

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-8 and 10 are considered in the Office action.

Claims 1-8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Hagiunda et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,182,225 (“Hagiunda”) in view of Jarrad U.S. Patent No. 6,047,197 (“Jarrad”).

The informal drawings filed with this application are objected to.

Reply

Claims 1-8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Hagiunda in view of Jarrad

Claim 1 recites a printing system including a network, a plurality of output printing devices coupled to the network, an application connected to the network, the application adapted to receive and display the status information of all of the output printing devices, and a user interface in communication with the application, the user interface including a toolset selector comprising first and second positions, the user interface adapted to display a print job interface when the toolset selector is in the first position, and display an output printing device interface when the toolset selector is in the second position. Neither Hagiunda nor Jarrad, alone or combined, describe or suggest the claimed invention.

Hagiunda describes a network that includes local area network 100, printers 102, 105 and 109, personal computers 103 and 104, and file server 106. (Col. 10, line 60 through Col. 11, line 4-12; FIG. 1). Network management software (alternatively referred to as “NetSpot”) operates on personal computer 103, and is capable of displaying a device list window that lists information about certain devices connected to the network. (Col. 14, lines 32-34; Col. 15, lines 15-18; Col. 16, lines 1-4; Col. 23, lines 12-14; Col. 79, lines 22-24; FIG. 15). Significantly, the device list window does not display information about all connected devices. Instead, the device list window only displays information regarding devices that: (1) include an agent program that runs as a background process on the device; (2) maintain a management information database (referred to as “MIB”) that has a specific structure; and (3) use an

object identifier specifically assigned to the Canon Corporation (the “Canon-MIB”). (Col. 23, lines 15-48; Col. 13, lines 14-18; Col. 12, line 27 through Col. 13, line 12).

The Examiner has disagreed with applicants’ assertion that Hagiunda does not describe or suggest an application connected adapted to receive and display the status information of all of the output printing devices. Apparently, the Examiner has relied on a portion of a single sentence in Hagiunda, taken out of context.. In particular, Hagiunda states that “The numeral 601 in FIG. 6 denotes the device list module which is a module for displaying on a list, all the devices connected to the network (this list is given in more detail in FIG. 15 as explained later).” (Col. 15, lines 15-18) (emphasis added). First, this sentence does not state anything regarding displaying status information regarding network devices. Second, the Examiner’s apparent reliance on the phrase “all the devices” is misplaced, particularly in light of Hagiunda’s discussion elsewhere regarding FIG. 15.

Indeed, as applicants previously discussed, in connection with the description of FIG. 15, Hagiunda expressly states that:

Devices shown on NetSpot are only network devices implemented for SNMP/Canon-MIB. . . . Network devices other than this cannot be displayed. . . . Further, devices not triggered by [the] network protocol used by NetSpot are also not displayed.

(Col. 23, lines 43-48) (emphasis added).

Inexplicably, the Office action fails to address this issue, and simply asserts that Hagiunda describes the claimed invention. As previously stated, unlike the claimed invention, Hagiunda does not describe or suggest a printing system including an application adapted to receive and display the status information of all of the output printing devices. Instead, Hagiunda points away from the claimed invention by limiting the device list window to display some, but not all, networked devices.

Further, as previously stated, the combination of Hagiunda and Jarrad does not describe or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, Jarrad describes a cellular telephone 10 that allows a user to select a display mode of operation using mode selector 82. (Col. 3, lines 66-67). In a first display mode of operation, display driver 62 displays a plurality of rows and columns of icons on display 30. (Col. 3, line 67 through Col. 4, line 4; FIG. 2). In a second mode of operation, display driver 62 displays a

column of icons and a corresponding column of text which defines a specified function or application that is performed whenever the corresponding icon is selected. (Col. 4, lines 4-9; FIG. 3). Whether cellular telephone 10 operates in the first or second mode of operation depends on the selected state of mode selector 82. (Col. 4, lines 9-12).

The Office action still has not identified any plausible suggestion or motivation to combine Hagiunda, which pertains to networked printing systems, with Jarrad, which pertains to cellular telephone displays. First, in conclusory fashion, the Office action states that it would have been obvious to modify the “displaying modes of Hagiunda” with the “switching mechanism of Jarrad” because such a modification would allow Hagiunda’s system “to switch between two display modes, allowing the user to easily change between display modes,” and “to improve the versatility of displaying data.” Other than by using hindsight gleaned from applicants’ disclosure, the Office action fails to identify any reason why a person of skill in the art would look to such disparate references, let alone somehow imagine combining the references. To counter that implausibility, the Office action merely states that “Jarrad is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem of displaying information and selecting modes.” Once again, this conclusory assertion provides no coherent explanation why a person of ordinary skill in the art would somehow conceive the combination of networked printing and cellular telephone display technologies.

Sweeping aside that issue, the Office action next fails to address applicants’ assertion that the combination of Hagiunda and Jarrad, even if possible, would not produce the claimed invention. As previously stated, the combination of Hagiunda and Jarrad seemingly would be a cellular telephone 10 that implements network management software, or network management software that provides information to a cellular telephone display. Even if this were somehow possible, the claimed invention would not result.

Because neither Hagiunda nor Jarrad, alone or combined, describe or suggest the claimed invention, applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejections of amended independent claim 1 be withdrawn. Because all other claims depend from claim 1, applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-8 and 10 be withdrawn.

Reply to Drawing Objections

Applicants submit herewith formal drawings that overcome the drawing objections.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1-8 and 10, is allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner allow this application.

Respectfully submitted,



James Trosino
Registration No. 39,862
Attorney for Applicants